



STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL

906 Columbia Street SW • P.O. Box 48350 • Olympia, Washington 98504-8350 • (360)
725-2967

**MINUTES
COMBINED
BUILDING, FIRE & PLUMBING CODES COMMITTEE
AND
MECHANICAL, VENTILATION & ENERGY CODES COMMITTEE**

Date: January 11, 2002

Location: Senate Hearing Room 3, Olympia, Washington

Committee Members Present: Dave Saunders, Chair of the Building, Fire & Plumbing Codes Committee; Jim Lewis; Sue Alden; Rory Calhoun; John Fulginiti; Dale Shafer; Rick Ford; Terry Poe; Bill Misocky; Steve Nuttall

Members Absent: Stan Price, Dave Baker

Visitors Present: John C. Cochran, Maureen Traxler, Jon Siu, Kraig Stevenson, Bob Eugene, Mary Kate Martin, Jerry Barbera, Dave Cantrell, Jon Julnes, John McDonald, Mark Triplett, Joe Andre

Staff Present: Tim Nogler, Al Rhoades, Krista Braaksma, Sue Mathers, Patti Thorn

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Dave Saunders, Chair of the Building, Fire & Plumbing Codes Committee. Everyone was welcomed and introductions were made.

REVIEW AND APPROVE AGENDA

The agenda was reviewed and amended to move the discussion to update Energy Code Interpretations under Staff Report. The agenda was approved as amended.

INTERPRETATION REQUEST

City of Seattle

The City of Seattle has requested an interpretation of UBC Chapter 11, Part III Accessibility for Existing Buildings, Section 1111, Additions and Section 1112, Alterations.

Their questions read:

1. When a new roof deck is added to an existing commercial building, is an accessible route, such as an elevator, required to the deck? If so, does the building official have authority to waive accessibility requirements if the cost of providing the accessible route exceeds 20% of the project?
2. When a mezzanine is added to an existing commercial building and the exceptions to Section 1103.2.2 do not apply, is an accessible route required to the mezzanine? Does the building official have authority to waive accessibility requirements if the cost exceeds 20% of the project?

The proposed answer reads:

Background: Applying the UBC definitions for “addition” and “alteration” to Chapter 11 - Part III can in some cases make it difficult to decide if a project should comply with Section 1111—Additions or Section 1112—Alterations. For applying Chapter 11 Accessibility requirements to an existing building how can it be determined whether a project is an “addition” or an “alteration”? UBC Section 1101—Scope states that Chapter 11 is intended to comply with the Americans With Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG). The ADAAG defines “addition” and “alteration” somewhat differently than the UBC. To determine the intent of the state code it is helpful to consider the ADAAG definitions, which are as follows:

Addition. *An expansion, extension, or increase in the gross floor area of a building or facility.*

Alteration. *An alteration is a change to a building or facility made by, on behalf of, or for the use of a public accommodation or commercial facility, that affects or could affect the usability of the building or facility or part thereof.*

In considering the questions above it is also important to note that in the UBC definitions, “floor area” includes the area within surrounding exterior walls or the useable area under a roof. The following answer to Question 1 assumes that the new roof deck has open sides and no roof cover.

1. Taking into consideration the ADAAG definitions, the new roof deck should be considered an *alteration* because it does affect the usability of the building or facility but does not increase the gross floor area included within the exterior walls of the building. Section 1112—Alterations would apply to the new roof deck. Section 1112.1.2—Existing Elements requires the new deck to be accessible. If the new deck will be an area of primary function the path of travel to the deck shall also be made accessible, to the extent feasible. Section 1112.1.2, Exception 3, would allow the building official to apply the 20% provision to exempt path of travel compliance.
2. Taking into consideration the ADAAG definitions, the new mezzanine should be considered an *addition* because it increases the gross floor area within the building. Section 1111—Additions would apply to the new mezzanine. An accessible route of travel to the mezzanine is required by Section 1111, Item 2. There is no provision which would allow the building official to waive accessibility requirements for the mezzanine.

Dave asked the Committee to consider the proposed interpretation and response as a standing motion for approval. The committee discussed the issue of “path of travel” and “area of primary function”. It was noted that a building official could exempt accessibility requirements in certain situations. Maureen Traxler, City of Seattle, was asked to clarify question 2. The discussion revealed that the interpretation needs to address two separate issues of access to a mezzanine addition, first from the floor where it is added and second from the public right-of-way.

Motion #1:

Dale Shafer moved to table the interpretation request until the March committee meeting. Bill Misocky seconded the motion. The motion carried with 9 in favor and 1 opposed.

Dave Saunders requested that the City of Seattle work with Al Rhoades to clarify their interpretation request.

STAFF REPORT

Update Energy Code Interpretations

In the past, as part of the code update cycle, the TAGs have reviewed standing interpretations to determine their applicability to the new codes. The Energy Code interpretations have not been reviewed in comparison to the 2000 and 2001 Editions. It was proposed that rather than convening a TAG to go through this process, the staff prepare a report on the applicability of past interpretations related to the most recent editions of the Energy Code.

Motion #2:

Dale Shafer moved that staff should prepare a report regarding Energy Code Interpretations. Sue Alden seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Detectable Warnings

Al Rhoades reported that the federal requirements for detectable warnings have been suspended on two separate occasions. In both cases the Council sent a letter to building officials advising that the requirements for detectable warnings **were not** being suspended in the state code; however, alternate methods for truncated domes would be acceptable. He noted that the last federal suspension expired July 26, 2001. From that date onward ADAAG was federal law. The issue before the Committee today is whether or not this affects the Washington State code. Al stated that the Council amended the truncated dome requirements in the Washington State code to say that alternates were acceptable. He also noted that ADAAG allows for alternate methods as well. His conclusion was there was no need to take any action to change the code.

Sue Alden concurred with Al's report. Rory Calhoun asked if there has been confusion on how to enforce this code aspect. Al stated that the only feedback he has received on this issue has been from Mr. John Julnes of Tilco Vanguard. Mr. Julnes was in attendance and stated that it was his intention to bring this issue before the full Council at the meeting later today.

Adult Family Home Rule Making

Al Rhoades directed the Committee to the CR-101 regarding Adult Family Homes. He noted that the decision was made at the last Council meeting to enter rulemaking to address the objections raised regarding the amendments related to Adult Family Homes that went into effect July 1, 2001. Al noted the prudence of waiting to see if the International Building Codes are adopted by the Legislature before moving ahead with this issue. He stated that the IBC treats this type of occupancy differently than the current UBC, which could affect the decision of how to address Adult Family Homes.

Motion #3:

Sue Alden moved to see what happens in the Legislative Session regarding adoption of codes and reconsider this issue at the March meeting. Rick Ford seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:47 a.m.